

REMARKS

Claims 5 and 6 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1-4 and 7 are canceled and claims 5-6 are amended, as suggested by the Examiner. The amendments are supported by the specification and the claims as originally filed. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 since this Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issue regarding further search and/or consideration since the Amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally-rejected claims and (d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary because it is made in reply to arguments raised in the rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggested amendments to the claims and for declaring that claim 5 contains allowable subject matter.

Claim 6 is objected to for containing the asserted informalities. Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggestions of "amending claim 1 to recite the alloy elements/ranges of claim 2 as an option." In order to expedite prosecution, claims 1-4 have been canceled and claim 4 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Further, claim 6 has been amended to clarify the weld metal as "the aluminum alloy for rapidly cooled welding" and to incorporate a welding step. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by two references to Kazuo et al., Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 60-159145 (hereinafter "Kazuo I") or Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 60-159147 (hereinafter "Kazuo II"), or by Hidenori et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 10-237577).

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1-2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Kazuo I or II or Hidenori et al.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Kazuo I, Kazuo II, or Hidenori et al. This rejection is also rendered moot.

Claim 6 has been amended to depend from claim 5. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 6 is patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 5, which the Examiner has stated contains allowable subject matter. Further, Applicants agree with the Examiner that "the prior art does not teach the presently claimed process step of cooling 1000-8000C/s from the melting point to 200C after welding, substantially as set forth in instant claim 6" (Office Action, page 6, lines 7-9).

Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Kazuo I, Kazuo II or Hidenori et al.

Claims 1, 4 and 6, and claim 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as

unpatentable over Usui et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 56-102562). These rejections are also moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 6 is patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 5, which the Examiner has stated contains allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot as to claims 1, 4 and 7, as these claims have been canceled.

As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Usui et al.

Claims 1, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 09-003582). This rejection is also moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 6 is patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 5, which the Examiner has stated contains allowable subject matter. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot as to claims 1 and 4, as these claims have been canceled.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Watanabe et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and request favorable action thereon.

In the event that this paper is not considered timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing Docket No. 108421-00079.

Respectfully submitted,



Amy E.L. Schoenhard
Registration No. 46,512

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

TECH/294532.1